DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 391 CG 013 813

AUTHOR Norris, Carol A.; Chan, Susy S.
TITLE Bostrom Alternative Center for Education: Interim Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Phoenix Union High School District, Ariz.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counseling Effectiveness; *Dropout Programs; *Educational Alternatives; High School Students; *Minority Groups; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Student Attitudes; Student School Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Bostrom Alternative Center for Education

ABSTRACT

The mid-year evaluation of the Bostrom Alternative Center for Education (BACE) during its third year of operation (1978-79) reviewed student characteristics, student termination, and results of student, parent and staff surveys. Students (N=334) attended Bostrom Center during the first semester. The academic program had the largest student enrollment (158); Life Skills (89) and GED (87) had similar size of enrollment. The majority of the students' ages ranged from 15 to 18 years old. Students were primarily Hispanic, black, and white, with a large proportion of non-white minority students. Most students had less than 10 credits earned toward graudation. About one-third of the students were dropouts for one or more years. Most of them came from schools within the Phoenix Union High School System and many had attended Bostrom Center previously. Students were referred to Bostrom through school counselors, friends, probation/parole officers. About 23% of the students were on probation/parole at the time of enrollment. By January 1979, 134 students were terminated. The dropout rate was about 22.5%. Among all terminated students, 63% withdrew for non-positive reasons; 11 obtained their GED Certificates. In general, students, parents and staff all endorsed the program as a success. Individualized support for student academic and social problems, understanding staff, small classes and self-paced learning helped change students' attitudes toward school. GED and vocational orientation in curriculum, coordination among staff members, and frequent parental contacts also facilitated student performance. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177391

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM

Bostrom Alternative Center for Education

Interim Evaluation Report

April, 1979

Report No. 37:03:78/79:002

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susy S. Chan
Carol A. Norris
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG013813

RESEARCH SERVICES

Susy S. Chan
Evaluation Specialist

Carol A. Norris, PhD
Director

ABSTRACT

This report presents the mid-year evaluation of the Bostrom Alternative Center for Education (BACE) during its third year of operation (1978-79). The areas reviewed are: (a) student characteristics, (b) student termination, and (c) results of student, parent and staff surveys.

Three hundred and thirty-four (334) students attended Bostrom Center during the first semester. The academic program had the largest student enrollment (158); Life Skills (89) and GED (87) had similar size of enrollment. Majority of the students ages ranged from 15 to 18 years old. Students were primarily in three ethnic groups; Hispanic, black and white, with a large proportion of non-white minority students. Most students had less than ten credits earned toward graduation. About one third of the students were dropouts for one or more years. Most of them came from schools within PUHSS and many had attended Bostrom Center previously. Students were referred to Bostrom through school counselors, friend, probation/parole officers. About 23% of the students were on probation/parole at the time of enrollment.

One hundred and thirty-four (134) students were terminated by January 1979. The dropout rate was about 22.5%. Among all terminated students, 63% withdrew for non-positive reasons. Eleven students obtained their GED Certificates.

In general, students, parents and staff all endorsed Bostrom Center as a successful educational facility for dropouts and adjudicated youths. Individualized support for student academic and social problems, understanding staff, small classes and self-paced learning helped change students' attitudes toward school. GED and vocational orientation in curriculum, coordination among staff members, and frequent parental contacts have also facilitated student performance. Areas needing further improvement are school facilities, resources, course offerings, parental involvement, counseling service, inservice, staffing and school publicity.

Recommendations include maintaining student enrollment; providing more in-service to staff, and sport activities and counseling support to students; improving school facilities, resources, encouraging parental involvement, and consolidating the academic program.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Student Characteristics	1
Student Termination	3
Opinion Surveys	9
Student Survey	9
Parent Survey	18
Staff Survey	22
Conclusions	30
Recommendations	31

Appendices

A	Student Information Sheet	34
B	Student Survey Questionnaire	36
C	Staff Survey Questionnaire	38
D	Staff Survey Questionnaire	40
E	Comments of Staff Survey	43

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Age Distribution of Bostrom Students	2
2	Ethnic Membership of Bostrom Students	2
3	Number of Credits Earned Toward Graduation by Bostrom Students	4
4	Year of Last School Semester Attended	4
5	Last School Attended by Bostrom Students	5
6	Source of Referral to Bostrom Center	6
7	Termination by Withdrawal Coding	8
8	Termination Reasons	8
9	Results of Bostrom Student Survey	11
10	Proportion of Positive Responses by Program	12
11	Proportion of Positive Responses by Attendance	12
12	Results of Bostrom Parent Survey	19
13	Results of Bostrom Staff Survey	23

INTRODUCTION

The Bostrom Alternative Center for Education (BACE) is an educational facility for dropouts and adjudicated delinquent youths within the Phoenix Union High School System (PUHSS). BACE began operations in October, 1976. Since that time three curricular areas--Academic, GED, and Life Skills--have been developed to accommodate the needs of students. ESEA Title IV:C has provided BACE with funds for its programs.

This report presents the mid-year ESEA Title IV:C evaluation of Bostrom Center during its third year of operation (1978-79). The areas reviewed are: (a) student characteristics, (b) student termination, and (c) results of student, parent and staff surveys.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

As of January 31, 1979 a total of 334 students attended Bostrom Center. There were 158 students (47%) enrolled in the Academic program, and 89 (27%), and 87 (26%) students in the Life Skills and the GED programs, respectively. On the basis of information reported by students at enrollment time (see Appendix A for the information sheet), these students can be described in several respects.

Age and Ethnicity

Table 1 shows that the majority of Bostrom students were 15-18 years old. Hispanic students were the dominant ethnic group (48.5%). There were an equal number of black and white students (23.1%) (See Table 2). Non-white students constituted approximately 76.7% of total student population.

Table 1

Age Distribution of Bostrom Students

Age	Number of Students	Percent
14	11	3.3%
15	65	19.5%
16	103	30.8%
17	98	29.3%
18	40	12.0%
19	9	2.7%
20	3	.9%
Data not reported	5	1.5%
	334	100.0%

Table 2

Ethnic Membership of Bostrom Students

Race	Number of Students	Percent
White	77	23.1%
Black	77	23.1%
Hispanic	162	48.5%
Native American	14	4.2%
Other	3	.9%
Data not reported	1	.3%
	334	100.0%

Credit

Table 3 presents number of credits earned toward graduation. Forty seven percent (47%) of students reported that they had earned less than 10 credits. Nearly 20% of the students had not earned any credit, and another 22.5% did not know how many credits they had at the time of enrollment.

Attendance

As shown in Table 4, nearly 30% of the students last attended school in or before 1977. In other words, these students were out of school for one to four years. Most students came from schools within the district (See Table 5). The primary home campuses were Browne, Carl Hayden, Maryvale, South, Phoenix Union, West, and CEC. About 31% of the students attended Bostrom previously, or were continuing students.

Referral

Students were referred to Bostrom Center through various sources, primarily by friends (29.3%), school counselors (14.7%), parole/probation officers (17.7%), parents (9.0%), or social workers (6.3%). Seventy-eight (78) students, or 23.4% of the total student population at Bostrom, reported that they were on probation or parole.

STUDENT TERMINATION

One hundred and thirty-four (134) students were terminated at Bostrom Center by January 31, 1979 for various reasons. Student termination data were analyzed in terms of (a) withdrawal coding used at all PUHSS schools, and (b) positive or negative reasons. Termination data were gathered from student status reporting forms prepared by Bostrom staff for Data Processing.

Table 3

Number of Credits Earned
Toward Graduation by
Bostrom Students

Credits	Number of Students	Percent
0	66	19.8%
1 - 5	96	28.7%
6 - 10	61	18.3%
11 - 15	28	8.4%
16 - 20	8	2.4%
Unknown	75	22.5%
	334	100.0%

Table 4

Year of Last School
Semester Attended

Year	Number of Students	Percent
1973	2	.6%
1974	4	1.2%
1975	4	1.2%
1976	17	5.1%
1977	75	22.5%
1978	216	64.7%
1979	1	.3%
Data not reported	15	4.5%
	334	100.0%

Table 5

Last School Attended
By Bostrom Students

School	Number of Students	Percent
Alhambra	9	2.7%
Browne	15	4.5%
Camelback	3	.9%
Central	5	1.5%
East	6	1.8%
Hayden	24	7.2%
Maryvale	17	5.1%
North	9	2.7%
South	25	7.5%
Union	19	5.7%
West	18	5.4%
CEC	15	4.5%
Elementary	13	3.9%
Lucky 13	1	.3%
Out of District	13	3.9%
Bostrom	104	31.1%
Other	36	10.8%
Data not reported	2	.6%
	334	100.0%

Table 6

Source of Referral to
Bostrom Center

Source of Referral	Number of Students	Percent
Counselor at School	49	14.7%
Friends	98	29.3%
Parents	30	9.0%
Parole/Probation Officer	59	17.7%
Social Worker	21	6.3%
Other	75	22.5%
Data not reported	2	.6%
	334	100.0%

37:78/79:002:rm

Withdrawal Coding

Following the withdrawal coding system used at all PUHSS schools, an estimate of 22.5% of dropout rate was obtained based on the formula: Dropout Rate = [(W1 + W2) - (R1 + R2)] /E, where

W1 = number of dropout students,

W2 = number of students removed from membership due to 10 or more days consecutive absence,

R1 = number of dropout (W-1) students returning to school,

R2 = number of (W-2) students returning to class, and

E = total enrollment.

Table 7 shows that 93 students (69.4%) of all terminated students dropped out of Bostrom (W-1), and 16 students (12%) were removed from membership due to 10 or more days consecutive absence (W-2). There were 32 R1 students and 2 R2 students being identified. Due to the incomplete information on entry and re-entry status of some students, the dropout rate (22.5%) should be regarded as an estimate.

Three students (2.2%) transferred to schools out of PUHSS (W-3), and 11 students (8.2%) transfered to other PUHSS schools (W-4). Eleven students (8.2%) obtained GED (W-5) by January, 1979.

Termination Reasons

Table 8 presents breakdown information on termination reasons. Among all terminated students, 49 (36.6%) students were positively terminated because they obtained GED (11) or jobs (20); transferred to other schools (15); or joined military (3). Fifty-one students(38%) were negatively terminated due to incarceration, disciplinary problems, or lack of interest or attendance. Thirty-four students (25.4%) withdrew for health reasons, family problems, moved, or for unknown

Table 7

Termination
By Withdrawal Coding

Code	Number of Students	Percent
W-1 (Dropout)	93	69.4%
W-2 (10 Consecutive Absence)	16	12.0%
W-3 (Out-of-District Transfer)	3	2.2%
W-4 (Intra-District Transfer)	11	8.2%
W-5 (Early Graduate)	11	8.2%
Total	134	100.0%

Table 8

Termination Reasons

Reasons	Number of Students	Percent
Positive Termination		
Obtained GED	11	8.2%
Employment/Job Training	20	15.0%
Transfered to other Schools	15	11.2%
Military	3	2.2%
	49	36.6%
Negative Termination		
Incarceration	13	9.7%
Disciplinary Problems	3	2.2%
Lack of Interest/Attendence	35	26.1%
	51	38.0%
Other Reasons		
Health/Preganacy	3	2.2%
Family Problems	5	3.7%
Moved	14	10.5%
Unknown	12	9.0%
	34	24.4%
Total	134	100.0%

reasons. By combining all non-positive termination, the dropout rate becomes 25% (85/334).

BOSTROM SURVEYS

Students, parents, and staff of Bostrom Alternative Center for Education were surveyed in February and March, 1979. These surveys were intended to assess their opinions and attitudes toward programs at Bostrom and areas needing further improvement. Sections below describe the instruments, procedures, and findings of these three surveys.

Student Survey

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed for the student survey, which contained 9 multiple choice items and 4 open-ended questions. These questions pertained to students' attitudes toward instructional and counseling support, course offerings, availability of instructional materials, and the overall program at Bostrom Center. The open-ended questions allowed students to indicate what they liked and disliked about Bostrom Center, additional help needed, and suggestions for the Center's improvement. Also asked were individual student's length of attendance at Bostrom Center and program of study (i.e., Life Skills, GED, or Academic). The questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

Procedure

The counselor at Bostrom Center conducted the student survey during the week of February 20, 1979. Responses were collected from 172 students, or 72% of total enrollment (approximately 240 students) during that time period.

Results

Results of student survey are presented in two sections: responses to multiple choice items and comments on open-ended items. These are discussed below.

1. Responses to Multiple Choice Items

Table 9 presents students' responses to Items 1-9 and Item 13, in the form of frequency counts and percentages of respondents to each choice and to each item. Missing data are also reported in the column of "no answer."

Overall Assessment. In terms of the overall assessment of Bostrom Center as an alternative school (Item 13), majority of respondents rated it as "excellent" (25.6%), "very good" (33.1%), or "fair" (28.5%). Six (6) or 3.5% of the respondents rated it negatively (i.e., "poor").

Assessment of Specific Components. Students' responses to Item 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 were largely favorable. These results suggest that most students thought they learned useful skills, received enough individual attention, improved attitude toward school, were satisfied with course offerings, and had a sense of belongingness at Bostrom Center. Item 6 and 8 received moderate endorsement. About two thirds of the students (67%) thought teachers gave them help outside of class time and discussed Bostrom with their parents. Only half of the students responded positively to Items 3 and 9. This suggests that the counseling program and instructional materials at Bostrom could be further improved to meet students' needs.

Breakdown of Positive Responses by Program. There were 66 students in the Life Skills, 27 students in the GED, and 71 students in the Academic program who responded to the survey. Eight (8) students did

Table 9

Results of Bostrom Student Survey

ITEM	RESPONSE			
	Yes	No	Undecided	No Answer
1. Will the skills you have learned at Bostrom help you in the future?	133 (77.3%)	5 (2.9%)	33 (19.2%)	1 (0.6%)
2. Do your teachers give you enough individual attention in the classroom?	144 (83.7%)	15 (8.7%)	13 (7.6%)	
3. Does the Counseling program at Bostrom meet your needs?	88 (51.2%)	36 (20.9%)	46 (26.7%)	2 (1.2%)
4. Has attending Bostrom improved your attitude toward school?	137 (79.7%)	22 (12.8%)	11 (6.4%)	2 (1.2%)
5. Are you satisfied with the course offerings at Bostrom?	130 (75.6%)	25 (14.5%)	16 (9.3%)	1 (0.6%)
6. Are your teachers willing to give you individual help outside of class time?	115 (66.9%)	18 (10.5%)	37 (21.5%)	2 (1.2%)
7. Do you feel that you "belong" at Bostrom?	129 (75.0%)	23 (13.4%)	20 (11.6%)	
8. Have you talked to your parents about Bostrom?	116 (67.4%)	46 (26.7%)	9 (5.2%)	1 (0.6%)
9. Do you think there are enough instructional materials at Bostrom?	86 (50.0%)	55 (32.0%)	26 (15.1%)	5 (2.9%)

	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer
13. Overall, how would you rate Bostrom as an alternative school?	44 (25.6%)	57 (33.1%)	49 (28.5%)	6 (3.5%)	16 (9.3%)

Table 10

Proportion of Positive Responses by Program

Item \ Program	Life Skills (N=66)	GED (N=27)	Academic (N=71)
1	72.7%	92.6%	76.1%
2	89.4%	92.6%	76.1%
3	53.0%	63.0%	43.7%
4	80.3%	88.9%	76.1%
5	78.8%	77.8%	73.2%
6	80.3%	77.8%	50.7%
7	81.8%	81.5%	67.6%
8	63.6%	88.9%	64.8%
9	53.0%	48.1%	47.9%

Table 11

Proportion of Postive Responses by Attendance

Item \ Program	Less than half year (N = 97)	Less than one year (N = 36)	More than one year (N = 29)
1	75.3%	80.6%	86.2%
2	84.5%	80.6%	93.1%
3	51.5%	41.7%	62.1%
4	76.3%	77.8%	96.6%
5	79.4%	77.8%	72.4%
6	60.8%	77.8%	75.9%
7	78.4%	66.7%	86.2%
8	69.1%	55.6%	82.8%
9	57.7%	50.0%	27.6%

not indicate their program of study, and were excluded from this analysis. Table 10 shows the proportion of students in the three programs who answered "yes" to Items 1-9. These statistics indicate that students in the GED group had more favorable attitudes toward Bostrom Center. On the contrary, the Academic group was more critical, especially about the counseling service (Item 3) and teacher's help outside of classroom (Item 6).

Breakdown of Positive Responses by Attendance. The proportion of positive responses from students attending Bostrom Center less than one-half year, less than one year, and more than one year is reported in Table 11. This analysis was based on 97 students who attended Bostrom Center less than one-half year, 36 students of less than one year's attendance, and 29 students of more than one year's attendance. Ten (10) students did not indicate the length and attendance and were excluded from analysis. These statistics show that students who attended Bostrom the longest period of time, among the three groups, had the most positive experience. But they were more critical about course offerings and the availability of instructional materials.

Significance Test of Program and Attendance Effects. To further observe the effects of program and length of attendance on students' attitudes, items 1-9 was grouped under three attitude factors. Items 1, 5, and 9 were grouped under "Curriculum," which pertained to competencies/skills taught at the Center, course offerings, and instructional materials. Items 2, 3, and 6 related to "Instructional/Counseling Support." Items 4, 7, and 8 were grouped under "Attitude" toward the Center. Students' responses were recoded in "yes"=+1, "no"=-1, and "undecided"= 0. Missing data were excluded from subsequent analyses.

Therefore each student would obtain a maximum of +3 and a minimum of -3 for each variable.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed using program as independent variable and three attitude factors--Curriculum, Instructional/Counseling Support, and Attitude--as dependent variables. Significant group differences were found in Instructional/Counseling Support ($F=5.36$, $df=2$ & 159, $p=.006$) and in Attitude ($F=2.92$, $df=2$ & 160, $p=.055$). Posteriori analyses (i.e. Scheffe) revealed that the Attitude of GED group was significantly more positive than the Academic Group ($p=.07$). The Attitude of the Life Skills group was between those two groups but not significantly different from either group. A similar result was also observed in the Instructional/Counseling Support of three groups. The GED group was significantly more favorable about the support they received than the Academic group (Scheffe, $p=.05$). The attitudes toward Instructional/Counseling Support of the Life Skills students were not very different from those two groups.

One-way analyses of variance were also performed to discern if response difference might be attributable to length of attendance. A significant F-ratio ($F=4.3$, $df=2$ & 158, $p=.014$) was obtained. Posteriori Scheffe test revealed that students who attended Bostrom more than one year had significantly more favorable attitude than those who attended Bostrom Center less than one year. Attitudes of students who attended Bostrom for the first semester was not different from either group of longest attendance or of medium attendance.

2. Responses to Open-Ended Items

Students' responses to item 10-13 are presented in this section. The number of students who made similar comments is indicated in parentheses. Some representative responses are also included.

What Students Liked about Bostrom. Understanding teachers (59), short school hours (31), people and fellow students (27), small and good classes (23), and self-paced learning (10), were the most favorable things about Bostrom Center. Students also liked CETA work experience program (4), short breaks (4), smoking privilege (4), Outward Bound program (3), and the size of school (4).

Representative Comments:

"Teachers care about your personal problems as well as your school problems."

"The hours are convenient."

"Good classes to choose from."

"The classes are small."

"Learning at your own pace."

"They provide you with a CETA job."

What Students Disliked about Bostrom. The most disliked aspects of Bostrom Center were fellow students' attitude (19), campus security (14), limited number of school activities (9), some teachers (8), and no lunch room (8). A few students also complained about the Center's location (5), too many students being admitted (5), short classes (4), short breaks (4), inadequate materials (3), and credit policy (2).

Representative Comments:

"The attitude of other students, especially how prejudiced the minorities are."

"Need more outside activities."

"Not having any sports activities."

"They are getting too many students."

"The classes aren't long enough."

"Not enough material to do more things."

Needed Help. In responding to Item 11: "If you think you need more help at Bostrom, what kind of help do you need that you are not getting?" Fourteen (14) students hoped Bostrom could provide them with job opportunities. Other students needed more individual attention (5),

or specific assistance in math, reading, and spelling (7). Outside activities and sports (3) were also mentioned here.

Representative Comments:

"I need more explaining on my work. I don't learn enough."

"Just more educational materials that make you learn more about education."

"Different subjects, guidance, and job."

"More outside school work, not just paper and pencil, getting involved with the things that will face you when you get out of school."

Suggestions for Center's Improvement. Students suggested that the school could be improved by fixing up its building (27); having more outside and sport activities (27), and more instructional materials (7); adding a cafeteria (7); and adjusting the size of enrollment (6). Also suggested are open campus (4), new security (4), and better scheduling, a free phone, lockers, a cross walk on 19th Avenue, and a daycare center for students who have children.

Representative Comments:

"Paint the school and rebuild it."

"Have basketball games on Friday."

"We could have extra materials that can help us learn more about everything."

"More scheduled so that a student would know how far long on a day to day basis. So his grade and date can be met."

Overall Comments. Many students commended Bostrom Center for having understanding teachers, changing their attitudes toward school, and providing individual help. Negative comments were again related to the lack of a physical education program and more outside activities. Some students urged the Center be kept open for them in the future.

Representative Comments:

"I really enjoy this school. It's something I look forward to each morning."

"It's the best school I have gone to so far, I like it and so do my friends."

"It keeps young people like me, that usually are not interested in schools."

"I think the teachers help you out a lot and it has helped me improve my attitude."

"It gives kids (an opportunity) who had almost given up hope on school."

"I think we need a physical education program."

"No football, baseball teams, and no drivers ed."

"I know that the schools financial budget is tight but I will help with funds and I know that other people will too. Leave the school open for us who want to go. It helps a lot."

Conclusions (Student Survey)

Majority of students showed favorable attitudes toward Bostrom Center: 25.6% - "excellent," 33.1% - "very good," and 28.5% - "fair." They indicated that Bostrom helped them learn useful skills, and improve their attitudes toward school. Understanding teachers, individual support for academic and personal problems, small classes self-paced learning, were other positive aspects of the Center. Understanding teachers and fellow students also made them feel they "belong" at Bostrom. Many students expressed that they enjoyed Bostrom more than other schools they previously attended. Students also pointed out that the counseling program should be strengthened. The need of more outside activities, a physical education program, and a better school building was also strongly expressed.

Since more than 75% of the Bostrom students are non-white minorities, it is possible that minority students rated peer groups as pluses, but white students felt racial balance was important.

Students in the GED program responded mostly favorably to this survey. The Academic group was most critical about the amount of academic and counseling support they received. This concurs with some

students' demand for more individual assistance in reading, math, and spelling. Students who attended Bostrom more than one year had more positive attitudes than their peers of shorter attendance. But they were most critical about the inadequacy of course offerings, a counseling program, and instructional materials at Bostrom.

Parent Survey

Instrument

The parent survey questionnaire contained both multiple-choice and open-ended questions (See Appendix C). Parents' perception of the academic progress, attitudinal and behavioral change of their children were assessed by the questionnaire. It allowed parents to make specific comments on Bostrom Center.

Procedure

Survey questionnaires were sent to 210 parents in February. A follow-up mailing was made in early March. The mailing list was based on District's roster of attending students as of mid-February, 1979.

Results

Fifty-eight (58) parents or 27.6% of the parents surveyed returned the questionnaire. Their responses are presented and discussed below.

1. Responses to Multiple-Choice Items

Table 12 presents parent's responses to specific questions, in frequency counts and proportion of respondents to each choice and to each item. Parents indicated that their children had improved attitudes toward school after attending Bostrom (94.8%), received adequate individual attention (89.6%), talked to them about Bostrom (87.9%), and attended school more regularly now (94.8%). Parents were less certain

Table 12

Results of Bostrom Parent Survey

ITEM	RESPONSE		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Is your son/daughter more interested in school since he/she began attending Bostrom?	55 (94.8%)	1 (1.7%)	2 (3.4%)
2. Do the staff members at Bostrom give your son/daughter enough individual attention?	52 (89.6%)	1 (1.7%)	5 (8.6%)
3. Does your son/daughter talk with you about the program at Bostrom?	51 (87.9%)	6 (10.3%)	1 (1.7%)
4. Has you son/daughter improved his/her basic skills at Bostrom?	42 (72.4%)	4 (6.9%)	12 (20.7%)
5. Has your son/daughter acquired some job skills at Bostrom?	37 (63.8%)	15 (25.9%)	6 (10.3%)
6. Does your son/daughter attend Bostrom more regularly than his/her previous school?	55 (94.8%)	0	3 (5.2%)
7. Do you get enough information about your son's/daughter's performance at Bostrom (through telephone calls, written reports, or home visits by staff members)?	37 (63.8%)	19 (32.6%)	2 (3.4%)

	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer
10. Overall, how would you rate the program at Bostrom?	25 (43.1%)	25 (43.1%)	1 (1.7%)	0	7 (12.1%)

about the academic (72.4%) and vocational skills (63.8%) their children acquired at Bostrom. Many parents expressed that they were not adequately informed of their children's performance at school (32.6%). Overall, majority of parents rated Bostrom Center as excellent or very good (86.2%).

These results are evidence of parents' support of Bostrom Center. They were satisfied with the amount of individual attention provided at Bostrom, and its impact on attitudes and behavior of their children. Parents were less certain about vocational and academic skills their children learned at Bostrom. In view of the number of credits students earned before entering Bostrom (see page 4), parent responses to Items 4 and 5 are generally positive. However, many parents felt they should receive more information about their children.

2. Responses to Open-Ended Items

What Parents Liked about Bostrom. Thirty-four (34) parents praised the staff at Bostrom for giving personal attention to students, and keeping close contact with parents. They also liked the short hours (6), job opportunities (3) and smaller classes (2) at Bostrom. Eight (8) parents were satisfied with everything about Bostrom. Some of their comments are listed below:

"The teachers show a true interest in helping children and give them an incentive to school work."

"Staff has completely turned around my daughter's attitude toward school."

"Promptness of notification of difficulty or absence."

"Convenience--school is only three hours long."

"They find jobs for the low income kids."

What Parents Disliked about Bostrom. The physical setting (3), no bus service (2), short hours (2), inadequate contact with parents (2), racial problem (1), the lack of job opportunity (1), and inadequate

materials and facility (2) were less favorable aspects of Bostrom. Two (2) parents were also concerned about the possibility of Bostrom being closed in the future. These comments were listed as follows:

"Short school days allows more free time for students than desired."

"What I dislike is the fact that a school and program that encourage children to stay in school is under consideration to be closed down."

"I think parents should receive more information on how their son or daughter is doing in school."

"I dislike the teachers not giving more attention. They don't even have enough materials.

"I like the old system of finding all students a job if needed. The new system is based on parents' salaries. I don't think it is fair, all students need to learn to be self sufficient."

Suggestions for Center's Improvement. Parents suggested Bostrom offer more activities (3), including sports, upgrade the building or to move to a better location (4), and have longer school hours (3), and communicate with parents more frequently (5). These include the following suggestions:

"Put more activities in school."

"Parents should receive more information about their children on their performance in school to see if the school is helping them any."

"More involvement of parents or programs that require student and parent participation."

"It needs more working hours."

"Newer or upgraded building."

"The cafeteria needs a machine with food in it because plenty of kids don't eat breakfast."

Overall Assessment. In general, parents who responded to this survey praised Bostrom's effort in keeping dropouts and juvenile delinquents in school. To many parents, Bostrom Center helped improve their children's attitudes, behaviors, and academic performance. Nevertheless the Center could be improved to serve its students better. Below are some of their comments:

"I feel that the program at Bostrom is very effective for the population it serves. However, another location would, I feel have a definite positive effect on student behavior."

"The program is excellent, I really feel. More material about the school should be available to the public. I believe that a lot of high school dropouts would go to Bostrom, but they don't know about the school."

"It helps young adults find their place and function in society which I feel is the largest and first step in preventing young adults from becoming juvenile delinquents."

"It gives my son an opportunity to work for and receive his GED."

Conclusion (Parent Survey)

About twenty-seven percent (27.6%) of parents at Bostrom responded to an opinion survey. They indicated that Bostrom Center helped improve attitudes, behaviors, and performance of their children. They praised the staff for giving attention to individual students. Many of them were in close contact with staff at Bostrom, but some felt inadequately informed of their children's performance. Some parents suggested that Bostrom provide more job opportunities, and longer school hours. They also recommended the physical setting be improved. Overall, parents expressed favorable attitudes toward Bostrom Center and endorsed it as a successful place for dropouts and juvenile delinquents.

Staff Survey

Instrument

The staff survey questionnaire included 14 questions concerning staffs' perception of curriculum, counseling program, communication with parents, support and services at Bostrom. Staff expressed their responses in attitude scale and specific comments. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix D.

Table 13

Results of Bostrom Staff Survey*

ITEM	RESPONSE				
	Very Successful	Successful	Not Successful	Uncertain	No Answer
1. How successful has the overall program been at Bostrom this year?	12 (41.4%)	15 (51.7%)	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)	0
2. Do you think the curriculum meets the needs of the students at Bostrom?	Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain	No Answer
GED	24 (82.8%)	3 (10.3%)	0	2 (6.9%)	1 (3.4%)
Life Skills	11 (37.9%)	14 (48.3)	0	3 (10.3%)	1 (3.4%)
Academic	10 (34.4%)	16 (55.2%)	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)
3. Do you think the Administrative Groups below support you?					
Board of Education	6 (20.7%)	18 (62.0%)	1 (3.4%)	3 (10.3%)	1 (3.4%)
District	11 (37.9%)	13 (44.9%)	0	4 (13.8%)	1 (3.4%)
Bostrom	22 (75.6%)	5 (17.3%)	1 (3.4%)	0	1 (3.4%)
4. Is the atmosphere at Bostrom conducive to learning/teaching?	17 (58.6%)	12 (41.4%)	0	0	0
5. Does the counseling program meet the needs of students at Bostrom?	10 (34.5%)	14 (48.3%)	3 (10.3%)	2 (6.9%)	0
	Very Closely	Somewhat Closely	Not Closely at all	Uncertain	No Answer
6. If you are an ESP (or non-ESP) staff, how closely do you work with non-ESP (or ESP) staff?	19 (65.5%)	7 (24.1%)	1 (3.4%)	0	2 (6.9%)
	Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain	No Answer
7. If you are an ESP (or non-ESP) staff, have you benefited from working with non-ESP (or ESP) staff?	20 (69.0%)	7 (24.1%)	1 (3.4%)	0 0	1 (3.4%)
		Frequently	Sometimes	Never	No Answer
8. How frequently do you communicate with the parents of Bostrom students?		5	19	3	2
Home Visits		5 (17.2%)	19 (65.5%)	3 (10.3%)	2 (6.9%)
Written Reports		8 (27.6%)	15 (51.8%)	2 (6.9%)	4 (13.8%)
Telephone		20 (69.0%)	6 (20.7%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (6.9%)
Other		6 (20.7%)	3 (10.3%)	0	20 (69.0%)

37:78/79:002rm

Results of Bostrom Staff Survey (cont)

ITEM	RESPONSE				
	Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain	No Answer
9. Does the inservice program meet your needs in teaching/counseling?	3 (10.3%)	12 (41.3%)	5 (17.2%)	3 (10.3%)	6 (20.7%)
10. Does the teacher contact with parents improve your ability in working with students?	17 (58.6%)	10 (34.4%)	0	0	2 (6.9%)
11. Does information/services provided by the psychologists and the social worker help you in classroom teaching?	17 (58.6%)	8 (27.6%)	0	0	4 (13.8%)
*	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor	No Answer
14. Overall, how would you rate Bostrom as an alternative school for dropouts?	13 (44.8%)	14 (48.2%)	1 (3.4%)	0	1 (3.4%)

* Staff's responses to item numbers 12 and 13 are presented in the comment section.

37:78/79:002:rm

Procedure

Thirty-three (33) staff members at Bostrom were surveyed, including all administrators, teachers, counselors, instructional aides, and entire staff of the exceptional students program (ESP). The evaluator collected data directly from staff members and assured anonymity of their responses.

Results

Twenty-nine (29), or 88.1% of staff members responded to this survey. Table 13 presents their responses in frequency counts and proportion of respondents for each question. These results are discussed along with staff's comments. A list of staff's comments is included in Appendix E.

Question 1: How successful has the overall program been at Bostrom this year?

Majority of staff considered this year's program at Bostrom Center had been successful (51.7%) or very successful (41.4%). They emphasized that the Center's success should be measured in various ways, however, increased student enrollment was most evident. Refinement in curriculum made it more possible to meet the changing needs of students. The comments also revealed that the GED program was the most successful, and the Academic program appeared to need more attention.

Question 2: Do you think the curriculum meets the needs of students at Bostrom? (GED, Life Skills, and Academic Program)

Both frequency counts and staff's comments pointed out the GED program was the most satisfactory among three programs offered at Bostrom. Staff felt that the Academic program should offer more electives, and Life Skills should have a greater concentration on vocational preparation. One person stressed the affective support needed by EH students,

which was usually not provided in formal curriculum. Since the curriculum has been under revision in the second semester, some felt positive about the new direction of expanding the alternative program in vocational areas.

Question 3: Do you think the administrative groups (Board of Education, District, and Bostrom) support you?

Responses showed that administrators at Bostrom Center were more supportive than other groups. Staff felt that Bostrom should make other district schools more aware of its programs. They also commented the Board should have a more open attitude toward the unique needs and problems at Bostrom.

Question 4: Is the atmosphere at Bostrom conducive to learning/teaching?

All respondents were positive. They agreed that due to the nature of the population at Bostrom, one-to-one type of instruction was useful. Nevertheless, smaller classes, more intensified individualization, and experimental learning activities were needed. A better school building, location, and facilities would enhance the learning/teaching atmosphere.

Question 5: Does the counseling program meet the needs of students at Bostrom?

Most of staff were satisfied with the counseling program. The counselors, social worker, as well as teachers provided counseling support to students. Since counseling staff had to spend a great deal of time on administrative tasks instead of actual counseling, staff felt more counselors were necessary to serve the large number of students in need of individualized counseling.

Question 6: How closely do you work with non-ESP/ESP staff?

Since Bostrom serves a large number of ESP students, team teaching and mainstreaming are two primary approaches used there. ESP and con-

tent teachers coordinate in teaching and counseling students, regardless of exceptionality. Questions 6 and 7 are specifically concerned about this team approach. Most staff reported that they worked closely with each other. They enjoyed co-teaching and compared methods, and ideas. One person thought the role and responsibility of ESP and content teachers should be better clarified.

Question 7: Have you benefited from working with non-ESP/ESP staff?

Most staff thought they were benefited from working together. Greater interaction, exchange of methods in dealing with students, or simply having an extra teacher in the classroom were some of the benefits. However, this team approach sometimes required reeducation of staff of different background and training in order to make teaming functional.

Question 8: How frequently do you communicate with parents of Bostrom students?

Staff contacted parents most frequently by telephone. Written reports and home visits were also frequently used. Parent conference at school, and ESP staffing were also useful means to communicate with parents. Parental involvement, coordination with community agencies and courts, were stressed.

Question 9: Does the in-service program meet your needs in teaching/counseling?

Only about ten percent of respondents were positive about adequacy of the in-service program. Some staff did not attend more than one in-service workshop. They suggested that forums be considered for discussion of various topics, such as drug and alcohol abuse.

Question 10: Does the teacher contact with parents improve your ability in working with students?

Most respondents agreed that parental contact improved the rapport

between teachers and students. It also helped establish a working cooperation between school and home, which helped ease disciplinary problems.

Question 11: Does information/services provided by the psychologist and the social worker help you in classroom teaching?

Most staff felt such information was helpful. They indicated that this information provided insights, and helped them prescribe appropriate teaching strategies. But the difficulty was also recognized that full utilization of test results in classroom environment was limited.

Question 12: What are the strengths and weaknesses of Bostrom as compared to previous years?

Strengths of this year's program were refinement of curriculum (14), better organizational structure and defined roles of staff (6), new ideas and methods (2), more jobs for students, and increased parental contact.

Among listed weaknesses, the lack of alternative setting and experimentation (4), too much paper work (2), and inadequate staff (3) were inhibiting factors. Also mentioned were uncertainty on staff, inadequate school facilities and in-service, and lack of interaction among staff.

Question 13: What are your recommendations for Bostrom?

As to curricular improvement, staff suggested that programs, particularly in vocational areas could be further refined. They also suggested more alternative settings, experimental approaches, and a variety of courses (including arts, PE and health education) be offered at Bostrom. The emphasis was on flexibility of curriculum for different students. In view of needed curriculum and instructional development, one staff urged that their effort be rewarded with stipend during summer. Several staff members suggested that the administration at

Bostrom be more streamlined, and administrators be more involved with students. Greater administrative support outside of Bostrom was needed, and especially for the alternative curriculum.

In terms of facilities and resources, staff recommended a better building, a cafeteria, hot lunch program, a library, or book mobile, more study rooms, books, teaching equipment, and transportation vehicles be considered. They also suggested more flexible room settings for EH students.

Other suggestions included making other district schools more aware of the Center, coordinating with agencies outside of school and obtaining greater financial support.

Question 14: Overall, how would you rate Bostrom as an alternative school for dropouts?

Most of staff (93%) rated Bostrom as an excellent or very good alternative school for dropouts in the Phoenix Metropolitan area. Alternative programs, highly individualized instruction, and cooperative staff were viewed as contributing factors to its success.

Conclusion (Staff Survey)

Eighty-eight percent (88%) of staff members participated in this opinion survey. Their responses showed a favorable attitude toward Bostrom Center. The contributing factors were refinement of curriculum to meet students' needs, individualization, supporting Adminstrators at Bostrom, good counseling staff and support, team approach in instruction, frequent communication with parents, and information/services provided by psychometrist and social worker. To improve the Center, they recommended that Bostrom Center provide a variety of classes and activities; expand the vocational program; consolidate the Academic program; seek support and awareness from the Board of Education and District; expand

the counseling and instructional staff; provide more individualized help conduct more in-service programs; streamline the administration; and renovate school facilities. Overall, they rated Bostrom Center as a successful educational facility for dropouts and juvenile delinquents.

CONCLUSIONS

This report draws the following conclusions on the basis of survey results, student demographic data, and termination information.

Three hundred and thirty-four (334) students attended Bostrom Center during the first semester. The Academic program had the largest student enrollment; Life Skills and GED had similar size of enrollment. Majority of the student ages ranged from 15 to 18 years old. Students were primarily in three ethnic groups: Hispanic, black and white, with a large proportion of non-white minority students. Most students had less than ten credits earned toward graduation. About one third of the students were dropouts for one or more years. Most of them came from schools within the PUHSS, and many attended Bostrom Center previously. Students were referred to Bostrom through school counselors, friends, probation/parole officers. About 23% of the students were on probation/ parole at the time of enrollment.

One hundred and thirty-four (134) students were terminated by January. The dropout rate was about 22.5%. Among all terminated students, 63% withdrew for non-positive reasons. Eleven students obtained GED.

In general, students, parents, and staff all endorsed Bostrom Center as a successful educational facility for dropouts and adjudicated youths. Individualized support for student academic and social problems,

understanding staff, small classes, and self-paced learning helped change students' attitudes toward school. GED and vocational orientation in curriculum, coordination among staff members, and frequent parental contacts have also facilitated student performance.

Students in the Academic program were less satisfied with the level of staff support. Staff also agreed that the Acadmeic area should be strengthened. Facilities, resources, course offerings, activities, parental involvement, counseling service, in-service and staffing also need further improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Maintain Student Enrollment at Current Level.

   Both students and staff have pointed out the need for greater academic and counseling support. Further increase in enrollment has to be considered in conjunction with staffing, facilities, and adequacy of support.

2. Add a Full-Time Counselor to the Current Counseling Staff.

   Since administrative tasks greatly restrict staffs' capacity in direct student counseling, an additional counselor would facilitate more individualized counseling. An alternative is to designate administrative responsibility of current staff to other support staff, to allow them more time in direct counseling.

3. Provide More In-service Opportunities for Staff.

   In-service programs can be presented in the form so as to foster greater communication among staff members. In-service topics should be concerned with student problems and staff responsibilites. Team teaching could also be formally examined in staff

in-service to make team approach more efficient, and to eliminate problems in coordination.

4. Inform Parents of their Children's Performance in School.

Continue the parental contacts through telephone calls, staffing, home visits, and reports. Encourage greater parental involvement in school-related activities, and provide parents with student information on a regular and formalized basis.

5. Consolidate the Academic Program.

The Academic program has the largest number of students and teachers among all three programs at Bostrom Center. Many students in this program have requested more support in basic skills from their teachers; while several staff members also pointed out the need for reexamination of the Academic program. It is recommended that the Academic program be consolidated through better teaming among teachers, and greater individualization in instruction. For those returning to home campuses for regular programs, the Academic program could serve a transitional role in providing greater remediation in reading, math, and English. For students continuing at Bostrom Center, this program must improve individual students' performance in basic skills.

6. Provide Sports Activities on a Regular Basis.

Parents, students, and staff all repeatedly expressed the need for such activities. It is recommended that the Center help students set up sports activities on a regular basis. These activities could be operated by students or under staff supervision.

7. Improve the School Facilities and Building.

Renovation of school buildings could be considered, or moving the school to a better location. More rooms, recreational, and instructional facilities are needed.

8. Expand the Instructional Materials, Course Offerings, and Equipment

More reading materials, different types of courses, and teaching/learning equipment are desired by students, parents, and staff.

9. Seek Greater External Awareness of Program at Bostrom Center.

Staff felt that other district schools should know more about Bostrom's alternative programs for dropouts and the adjudicated for referral. Greater awareness could also promote the support of outside administrative groups. It is recommended that Bostrom Center continue to use district newsletter as a means of communication.

10. Provide Information on Students Behavioral Change.

Parents have reported improved school attendance of their children; while students reported improved attitudes toward school. It is recommended that Bostrom staff collect behavioral information on individual students to demonstrate the positive change in student's attendance and delinquent behaviors. This information could serve as an additional evidence of the Center's effectiveness.

11. Review Existing Curriculum and Plan Future Revisions.

Curriculum at Bostrom Center has been under constant revisions to accommodate student needs. It is recommended that staff members review the existing curriculum and plan the program for the next year. This should provide staff an organized view of future direction and help coordinate the curriculum and instructional development activities.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

BOSTROM ALTERNATIVE CENTER FOR EDUCATION
(BACE)

21-22 DATE_____

1-10 LAST NAME

12-19 FIRST NAME

24-29 STUDENT NUMBER

31-32 AGE

34 ETHNIC GROUP
1. ☐ WHITE
2. ☐ BLACK
3. ☐ MEXICAN AMERICAN
4. ☐ AMERICAN INDIAN
5. ☐ OTHER

36 DID YOU ATTEND SCHOOL LAST YEAR
1. ☐ YES
2. ☐ NO

38-39 WHAT SCHOOL DID YOU MOST RECENTLY ATTEND?_____ 41-42 WHEN_____
(INCLUDING TRANSITION SCHOOL)

44 HOW MANY CREDITS DO YOU THINK YOU HAVE?
1. ☐ 0
2. ☐ 1 - 5
3. ☐ 6 -10
4. ☐ 11-15
5. ☐ 16-20
6. ☐ DON'T KNOW

46 WHO SENT YOU TO TRANSITION SCHOOL?
1. ☐ COUNSELOR AT SCHOOL
2. ☐ FRIEND
3. ☐ PARENTS
4. ☐ PAROLE/PROBATION OFFICER
5. ☐ SOCIAL WORKER
6. ☐ OTHER

48 WHICH PROGRAM ARE YOU ENROLLED IN?
1. ☐ LIFE SKILLS
2. ☐ ACADEMIC
3. ☐ GED

50 ARE YOU ON PROBATION OR PAROLE?
1. ☐ YES
2. ☐ NO

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

HRPA_____	8-9	WRAT_____	14-16	GED_____	30-31	ESP_____	43
M²PT_____	11-12	_____	18-20	_____	33-34		
		_____	22-24	_____	36-37		
CREDITS_____	50-51	_____	26-28	_____	39-40		
TERMINATION_____	53-54			_____	42-43		
DATE_____	56-57			AV _____	45-46		

RM:7/78

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM

Bostrom Alternative Center for Education

Student Survey

February 20, 1979

Dear Student:

We would like to know what you think about Bostrom Alternative Center for Education. Your opinions will help us improve the program at Bostrom. Please respond to the questions below and return this form to your teacher.

Check your attendance at Bostrom:	Less than 1/2 year ☐	Less than one year ☐	More than one year ☐
Check the program you are enrolled in:	Life Skills ☐	GED ☐	Academic ☐

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Will the skills you have learned at Bostrom help you in the future?	☐	☐	☐
2. Do your teachers give you enough individual attention in the classroom?	☐	☐	☐
3. Does the counseling program at Bostrom meet your needs?	☐	☐	☐
4. Has attending Bostrom improved your attitude toward school?	☐	☐	☐
5. Are you satisfied with the course offerings at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
6. Are your teachers willing to give you individual help outside of class time?	☐	☐	☐
7. Do you feel that you "belong" at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
8. Have you talked to your parents about Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
9. Do you think there are enough instructional materials at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐

10. What do you <u>like</u> and what do you <u>not like</u> about Bostrom?

Likes	Dislikes
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

11. If you think you need more help at Bostrom, what kind of help do you need that you are not getting?

Comments: _____

_____

12. How could Bostrom be improved?

Comments: _____

_____

13. Overall, how would you rate Bostrom as an alternative school? Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

Comments: _____

_____

_____

42

37:003:79
SC:rm:2/9

37:78/79:002:rm

APPENDIX C

PARENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM

Bostrom Alternative Center for Education

Parent Survey

February 19, 1979

Dear Parents:

We would like to know your opinion about the program at Bostrom Alternative Center for Education, formally Transition School). Please answer the questions below and return the questionnaire, by February 28, in the enclosed envelope. Your reponse will help us evaluate the program at Bostrom. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Susy Chan

Susy Chan, Evaluation Specialist
Research Services (257-3612)

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Is your son/daughter more interested in school since he/she began attending Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
2. Do the staff members at Bostrom give your son/daughter enough individual attention?	☐	☐	☐
3. Does your son/daughter talk with you about the program at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
4. Has your son/daughter improved his/her skills at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
5. Has your son/daughter acquired some job skills at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐
6. Does your son/daughter attend Bostrom more regularly than his/her previous school?	☐	☐	☐
7. Do you get enough information about your son's/daughter's performance at Bostrom (through telpenone calls, written reports or home visits by staff members)?	☐	☐	☐

8. What do you like and what do you not like about Bostrom?

Likes	Dislikes

9. How could Bostrom be improved?

Comments: _____

	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor
10. Overall, how would you rate the program at Bostrom?	☐	☐	☐	☐

37:002:79
SC:rm:2/9

37:78/79:002:rm

APPENDIX D

STAFF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM

Bostrom Alternative Center for Education — February 14, 1979

Staff Survey

1. How successful has the overall program been at Bostrom this year?

Very Successful	Successful	Not Successful	Uncertain
☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

_____

2. Do you think the curriculum meets the needs of students at Bostrom?

	Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain
GED	☐	☐	☐	☐
Life Skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

3. Do you think the Administrative Groups below support you?

	Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain
Board of Education	☐	☐	☐	☐
District	☐	☐	☐	☐
Bostrom	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

4. Is the atmosphere at Bostrom conducive to learning/teaching?

Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain
☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

5. Does the counseling program meet the needs of students at Bostrom?

Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain
☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

Are you an ESP Staff? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. How closely do you work with non-ESP staff (if yes) or ESP staff (if no)?

Very Closely	Somewhat Closely	Not closely at all	Uncertain	N/A
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

7. Have you benefited from working with non-ESP staff (if yes) or ESP staff (if no)?

Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all	Uncertain	N/A
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: _____

_____

37:004:79
SC:rm/2/9

37:78/79:002:rm

8. How frequently do you communicate with parents of Bostrom students?

	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
Home Visits	☐	☐	☐
Written Reports	☐	☐	☐
Telephone Calls	☐	☐	☐
Other_____	☐	☐	☐

Comments:_____

_____

9. Does the inservice program meet your needs in teaching/counseling?

Definitely ☐ Somewhat ☐ Not at all ☐ Uncertain ☐ N/A ☐

Comments:_____

_____

_____

10. Does the teacher contact with parents improve your ability in working with students?

Definitely ☐ Somewhat ☐ Not at all ☐ Uncertain ☐ N/A ☐

Comments:_____

_____

_____

11. Does information/services provided by the psychologist and the social worker help you in classroom teaching?

Definitely ☐ Somewhat ☐ Not at all ☐ Uncertain ☐ N/A ☐

Comments:_____

_____

_____

12. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Bostrom this year as compared to previous years?

Strengths:_____

_____

Weaknesses:_____

_____

13. What are your recommendations for Bostrom?

Curriculum:_____

_____

Administration:_____

_____

Facilities & Resources:_____

_____

Other:_____

_____

14. Overall, how would you rate Bostrom as an alternative school for dropouts?

Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

Comments:_____

_____

_____

37:004:79
SC:rm:2/9

47

37:78/79:002:rm

APPENDIX E

COMMENTS OF STAFF SURVEY

BOSTROM STAFF SURVEY**

Question 1: How successful has the overall program been at Bostrom this year?

* Program has experienced even more positive changes and increased enrollment in past couple years.

* Academic success questionable - tests used invalid. GED - the most promising aspect. Life Skills - criterion for evaluation not established. To date the latter has not reached enough students.

* The individual successes here and there keep me going but at times the overall general status quo of things is too disheartening. School related growth/change is very evident - but in the "outside world" things don't change!

* Only careful analysis of the entire school system at Bostrom; its personnel, its administrative procedures, the degree of actual change in student population status and progress could determine its success.

* I'll answer this in four parts according to programs: Academic -- uncertain; Life Skills -- successful; GED -- Very successful; Overall -- successful.

* Most of our young people live in a crisis type environment. They get support here which enables them to maintain in their own environment, but real measurable progress is slight.

* I've noticed more improvement overall this year than last year.

* It seems this year we have more students and they are here more often. This rates success to me.

* More successful 2nd semester!

* I see our program as fulfilling the needs of a variety of students that other schools cannot. It is a worthwhile feeling to see positive results of such students.

* I see a definite refinement of the overall structure and organization of the program this year. I am happy with this and feel we are very successful.

Question 2: Do you think the curriculum meets the needs at Bostrom? (GED, Life Skills, and Academic)

* Often because of the specific type of individual involved, it is difficult if not impossible for a school to suit some students.

**Duplicate comments are excluded from this list.

* The competitive nature of similar programs throughout the district necessitated a unique curriculum approach in Life Skills and GED. Not sure about Academic.

* Academic is supposed to be a transitory state to ready the child for regular schooling. It has failed to date.

* Special Ed. students (especially the EH) needs are often not met with any curriculum but the affective contact between peers and students and society.

* The curriculum needs to become more alternative - needs to get out of the classroom.

* Needs greater concentration on voc-preparation in Life Skills. Needs more variety in curriculum for Academic -- interesting electives.

* We need more practical classes such as Child Care, Energy conserving classes, creative classes, physical education, art, music, and dance.

* Problem: Our ethnic population values traditional education so that real alternatives are suspect and the traditional schooling is "boring" to them.

* We have made a program change for 2nd semester which is proving to be very successful in every respect.

* I feel the teachers work hard and constantly change the curriculum to meet student needs.

* The curriculum of the Academic program is continually being revised. But at the present time is quite detailed, complete, and relevant for our students.

Question 3: Do you think the Administrative Groups (Board of Education, District, and Bostrom) support you?

* I don't feel that the Board of Education has opened their eyes to the extreme need for this program and does not give us support at all.

* Program deserves greater awareness in the district.

* Administration interested in promoting their own careers at the expense of classroom teachers and students. Administration has signed contracts and failed to comply with the terms set forth.

* _____ is ignorant!

* Bostrom administrators are very supportive.

* Referrals within our district are limited. We need more district people to know our program exists.

Question 4: Is the atmosphere at Bostrom conducive to learning/teaching?

* Some teachers and administrators can control their students others cannot.

* Overcrowding of a small school can be potentially explosive being that Bostrom is considered the only one of its kind in Phoenix.

* The atmosphere for learning would improve if more and more learning would involve projects and experience outside of the classroom.

* Very sensitive to individual needs.

* My reserve is because of socio-economic interference, and no reflection upon Bostrom.

* It's a day by day interaction - so many factors can disrupt or enhance the atmosphere that we have no control over.

* We need better school facilities and a better location!

* The building we are housed in is run-down, in an undesirable location, creates negative atmosphere for learning.

* It's very difficult to teach turned-off, emotionally disturbed people in a regular classroom setting. Most need one on one attention.

* Personalities make this a great place. It is a very loose, but structural school.

Question 5: Does the counseling program meet the needs of students at Bostrom?

* Good counseling staff, works closely with many students and follows through on problem solving and crisis intervention.

* Teachers play a strong role as primary counselors. Our students have massive needs and additional counseling services could certainly be used.

* Counseling techniques vary with degree and type of counseling training.

* Social Worker is making valiant effort. ESP department head was never around.

* The counselors must do a great deal of paper work which takes away student contact time.

* More staff needed.

* Two certified counselors for 225 kids - impossible!

* Administrative paperwork reduces time counselors have with student.

* _____ and _____ seem to be more administrative than spending their time and effort counseling with students.

* Too many flames to put out. We need more help. Also more male help. We need to get more help within our contract.

* More so than regular high schools.

* I see a need for more time for 1:1 counseling.

Question 6: How closely do you work with non-ESP staff (if yes) or ESP staff (if no)?

* Have found most non-ESP staff very concerned about the needs of ESP students and very interested in learning how to work with them.

* Enjoy the give and take and team approach.

* Role responsibility still need to clarified and/or defined.

* Comparisons of methods, ideas, plans, etc.

* It is a highly beneficial combination for students.

Question 7: Have you benefited from working with non-ESP staff (if yes) or ESP staff (if no)?

* Learned a great deal concerning coping with the students problems and assisting them in coping with themselves.

* Learning specific problems concerning individual students.

* Helped in realizing that tremendous PR and re-education of content teacher to special education and vice versa is badly needed.

* Teacher exchange and interaction is always beneficial.

* Teachers are helpful and provide valuable information.

* The benefit comes from having an extra person in the classroom, not from methods/curriculum presented to students.

* They have helped me realize importance of structuring instructional materials for ESP kids.

* Between the two of us (my strengths being in the areas of exceptionality with my partner's academic) we manage to cover every area needed.

* No. I have a broad background and I find a lot of time is spent on reeducating the non-ESP staff. There is a certain resistance.

Question 8: How frequently do you communicate with parents of Bostrom students?

* At times several people within the same school call the same student.

* Conferences is an important aspect of the Bostrom student.

* Courts/P.O.'s/JOb's/Community Agencies; There needs to be a total team approach for our students: Home/School/Courts/Community Agencies/ Record Contacts.

* Informal staffing is a very important part of parent-student-teacher communication.

* We often find ourselves spending more time with the problems of young people who do not live with their families. (Parent conferences)

* The more contact the more knowledge of the student. (Open House)

* Call and check on absences.

Question 9: Does the in-service program meet your needs in teaching/ counseling?

* Most of the in-service seems inappropriate and below the level of most teachers - Example _____.

* Lack of follow-up on any critical areas explored to which solutions were identified but not operational.

* Some of the programs are directly related to my field and/or interest, others are not.

* We need more particularly forums (Indians, child abuse, Drug & alcohol abuse, Suicide).

* We really have not had any in-service.

* One hour has been useful this entire year.

* I have only experienced one in-service.

* I feel there should be more - they are too few and far between.

* The Forums are good because people come together to work out problems. Other types of in-service with so-called "experts" are generally a waste of time.

* More is needed to tighten up the ESP program. More continuity is needed.

* What in-service program?

Question 10: Does the teacher contact with parents improve your ability in working with students?

* Social conditions which are a reality to some of these students would prevent any real intervention without the support of other helping agencies.

* It often demonstrates to the students that the school and home have the same message - and have a working cooperation established. It eases discipline problems.

* A humanistic appropach to people helps in all areas.

* Especially in cases where there are severe problems in a student's life that is carrying over to school.

* It helps us work together and provides needed information.

* Parental involvement varies - those who do get involved usually do help our teacher-student relationships.

* Parental contact probably improves my ability in working with students more than anything else I could do.

* Improves rapport and student attitude to school and work.

* Depends on the individual circumstance, some parents just don't care.

Question 11: Does information/services provided by the psychologist and the social worker help you in classroom teaching?

* The historical problem with such reports is to operationalize the findings in a limited classroom environment.

* It offers insights and information that result in a more accurate teaching strategy.

* Need more of them. Perhaps ESP department head could attend less meetings and work with students to a greater degree.

* They work with us in every aspect: from providing further testing services to drug, or pregnancy counseling services.

* Services by psychologist are too sporadic to be really valuable. Information from social worker is extremely valuable.

* It helps us work together and provides needed information.

* Committed staff provides valuable information on student. In-service sponsored by our social worker has been of great help.

* Often I wonder if we could even survive without their services.

Question 12: What are the strengths and weaknesses of Bostrom as compared to previous years?

STRENGTHS:

* New staff changes have been an improvement to school unity.

* That an alternative program even exists.

* Instructors are encouraged to employ new ideas and methods.

* Instructors opinions are valued and sought out.

* Increase this year in providing jobs for non-CETA eligible students.

* Refinement of programs - Academic, GED, Alternative (Life Skills).

* More diversified subdivisions of students so goals in any one program or subdivisions aren't too varied.

* Better organizational structure. Everyone knew before year started how new program would be set up and this had provided stability in the classroom.

* Staff expertise and sensitivity; flexibility of program - intention of staff to assess and attempt to meet need of individual students.

* I'm a better teacher; and the materials and methods I use have improved too. The curriculum in general meets the needs of the students.

* The kids are off the street.

* The new organization of curriculum into two areas: Academic and careers, serves our students' need much better.

* BACE tries to fulfill changing student population needs.

* New programs developed to accommodate every age and type of student and more of a variety of services provided.

* Better screening of pupils.

* Overall structures of the school, curriculum, increased parent contact.

* Staff is able to function more smoothly and professionally as job descriptions become well defined and people gain expertise.

WEAKNESSES:

* Uncertainty of future of school leads to uncertainty on staff.

* Expansion of facilities is needed.

* Fall into much of the same bureaucratic restrictions and limitations which hinder experimentations particularly in the academic component. Curriculum is too traditional.

* Not enough discipline for students.

* An increasing amount of paperwork and non-student related (not directly) activities (i.e. absentee forms of two or three different types that must be filled out on one absence).

* The students sometimes do not know where they are going. Need to get more into developing self-concepts of students.

* Not enough time to communicate.

* ESP staff overwhelmed with paperwork - staffings - etc.; in processing new referrals thereby leaving inadequate time for working closely with students and parents.

* Transportation.

* Need for more alternative settings for learning.

* Classes are too large to deal effectively with the ESP students.

* Program reorgnized once again. Not much foresight on this campus.

* The building remains the major weakness to me.

* Various programs are so involved within their own set-up the total BACE staff has less interaction.

* Shop areas are not properly equipped. Need more in-service.

* Not enough staff.

Question 13: What are your recommendations for Bostrom?

CURRICULUM:

* Refinement and constant modifications to apply to any level of student ability.

* Improve "alternative" choices - less like regular programs. Find ways to demonstrate/prove the need for education to the students.

* Streamline and improve vocational curriculum with possible coordination with AVC.

* More experimental in order to meet needs of a very tactile oriented population.

* There is a definite need for a Health Class -- include Sex Education for all students. Desperate need for Arts and Crafts program; and more physical activity. Also for Bachelor Survival course.

* Need greater concentration on voc-preparation in Life Skills. Need more variety of interesting electives in curriculum for Academic.

* More related topics - child care; also P.E. Art/Music/Dance.

* More alternative settings for learning.

* To be developed during summer or school year for stipend. It is not part of regular classroom teachers' job.

* We now have the organization - but need time to plan and re-organize curriculum in careers area.

* Individual curricula should be available from each ESP program in all schools as a resource.

ADMINISTRATION:

* More on campus supervision from the director.

* Good leadership.

* Decreasing duplication of effort - more definite flow of information procedures.

* Continue the present "Freedom" of choice/selection of staff members. An alternative program needs "Alternative" instructors.

* Don't get too top heavy.

* More experimental in order to meet needs of a very tactile oriented population.

* The Director to be our administrator and not so involved with the District's use of his skills for their needs.

* More support from administrators.

* Provide support for the alternative curriculum.

* Needs to be more involved with classroom - students should know them other than for disciplinary actions.

* Need their belief in our program: with the exception of our own administration.

* Reduce -- too many chiefs revelling in their importance.

FACILITIES & RESOURCES:

* Need more recreational facilities and a cafeteria.

* Need new facilities to improve overall environment.

* Restrict the population of students to not more than 200.

* More and better transportation so we can get students involved with outside activities.

* Seek a new building for 1980-81 school year which is more centralized in the district to make program more available to all district students.

* More room - some rooms need (mobile) partitions - too many behavioral and emotional problems in a very academically individualized setting.

* Day care program is desperately needed but no room in present location. This is a good facility as students are comfortable here but need more room and need private offices fon counseling staff.

* Need more special programs.

* We need more up-to-date learning equipment.

* Get library or book mobile. Establish reading period for entire school. New site with refrigeration.

* Hot lunch program.

* Make the best with what we have - that is saying alot.

* It would be nice to have a permanent facility to know where we would be each year!

* We need more materials such as books, study rooms, magazines, and assorted reading and resource materials.

OTHER:

* Educate staff in the other district schools regarding the programs at BACE to assist them in making referrals to BACE.

* Team effort with P.O.'s/Parents/Guardians/Courts/Police/Community Agencies inside the school - daily contact and learning to meet the needs of our students.

* Better coordination of ESP and classroom teacher. Job descriptions for all areas.

* Support services and funding should be expanded.

Question 14: Overall, how would you rate Bostrom as an alternative school for dropouts?

* If the rating is not excellent it is due to the lack of support from Board of Education, which hinders in the acquisition of the facilities needed to improve the school. The faculty is very dedicated and I feel does a wonderful job considering what they have to work with.

* Provides the needed alternative to dropouts in the Phoenix Metro area. Good Staff!

* Most students I deal with have an intensive need for the individualized attention we are able to give.

* From the standpoint of the student perspective, probably excellent; from the teacher's perspective, a political ball to be bounced around.

* Outstanding staff. A continued stress on "Different Avenues" for learning is needed.

* Always testing things out and adjusting to better meet needs.

* GED by far is the superior aspect of this program. It has very little interference from the administration.

* We could be excellent whenever we get everything together.

* BACE has incurred many changes to keep abreast of changing student needs -- this flexibility has benefited many students.

* For the three years that this school has been open they have worked wonders.

* We provide the stabling influence in many ways of these students' lives.